

Date: Sun, 13 Feb 94 04:30:09 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #55
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 13 Feb 94 Volume 94 : Issue 55

Today's Topics:

 Date on 610 form
 Exams are Trivial? (3 msgs)
I just HAD to. WAS: The 10-meters band - No CW required ? (3 msgs)
 Operating in Canada? (2 msgs)
 Unbelievable: Pirates on air-to-ground frequencies

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 12 Feb 1994 22:20:57 -0800
From: news.cerf.net!coyote.rain.org!coyote!jay@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Date on 610 form
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I recently submitted my license renewal to FCC on a 610 form dated 1991.
Today I got a letter in the mail from "The W5YI Group, Inc." with a
November 1993 610 form and a note stating that previous editions of the
form will not be accepted.

The letter also indicated that I should send the completed form to The
W5YI Group along with a \$5 "processing fee" rather than to the FCC.

As it is intuitively obvious that The W5YI Group, Inc. will merely open all
such renewal requests, remove the money, and remail them to the FCC, it
makes little sense to send the form (or the money) to W5YI, Inc.

However, their letter does concern me. What will the FCC do with my

renewal request? Does it go into the bit bucket due to the old form?

Should I send another request to FCC using the new 610 that W5YI so thoughtfully provided? If so, how do I answer question 7, "If you have filed another Form 610 that we have not acted upon, purpose of other form and date filed?"

My license is due to expire 2/17/94.

de WB6RDV

--

Jay Hennigan | "I want to make it very clear that this middle-class tax cut,
jay@rain.org | in my view, is central to any attempt we're going to make to
Santa Barbara CA | have a short-term economic strategy." - Bill Clinton, 1/19/92

Date: Sat, 12 Feb 94 16:54:24 EST
From: agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!mystis!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Exams are Trivial?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

ez006683@chip.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

> David R Tucker (drt@world.std.com) wrote:
> : It doesn't. When the Code requirement was removed from the Technician
> : license, the ARRL insisted that, since it would become an entry level
> : license, that all of element 3 along with element 2 was just too
> : difficult for an entry level license, and "element 2+" was created.
> Can you say historical revisionism? I knew you could.
> Next week by drt:
> "No-code scum are the reason for incentive licensing."
> :-)
> : Before that, no one was allowed full power without passing the
> : material on all of element 3, which is no "final exam." They not only
> : eliminated the code, they eliminated 3B from the *old* technician
> : license to give the current tech plus. "Less theory, same great
> : privileges!"
>
> When was 3 split into A and B? I thought it was before the no-code license
> was introduced.
>
> Ah! here it is....
> According "New Novice Voice Class FCC license Preparation" by Fred Maia
> and Gordon West, published by Radio Shaft in 1987. Only elements 2, 3A
> and 1B were required to earn a Technician license. So... was the League
> so far sighted that they saw no-code as inevitable before 1987? If

> someone knows when 3 was split please post. I now KNOW it was well
> before the no-code license, but more precise data is appreciated.

OK, It happend during the few years I was away from Amateur Radio, does
anyone really know? (Maybe the ARRL guys?)

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV		Pots have handles,		'Climage is what we
dan@mystis.wariat.org		Magazines have personals,		expect, weather is
ac447@po.cwru.edu		Hams have names.		what we get.' -L. Long

Date: Thu, 10 Feb 1994 14:12:26 -0800
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
kos4mac22.berkeley.edu!user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Exams are Trivial?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Feb9.175912.16714@cs.brown.edu>,
md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) wrote:

>timi@mendel.berkeley.edu (Tim Ikeda) writes:

>
>> Because Ham radio isn't just about circuit design? Exactly *who* do
>> you want to exclude from Ham radio? And why? I don't understand;
>> if you want to excel at state of the art radio communications, go
>> for it. Who's stopping you? Does my inability to draw a Colpitts
>> oscillator from memory somehow reduce your satisfaction?
>
> Why is it that people in this country think that you have to make
> everything so damn easy that anyone who wants anything just has to
> ask for it and ye shall receive? Why are we "afraid" to "offend"
> someone by telling them, "gee, sorry, you'll have to WORK for this"?
> Why is it that people are starting to equate "work" with "exclusion"?

Who said anything about equating work with exclusion? I'm suggesting
that people enter amateur radio for different purposes. This is
a very different slant. My questions are: "What are you trying to
distinguish with the tests -and- What are you screening for?" There's
nothing wrong with increasing privileges for people who demonstrate
increasing levels of proficiency. But the basic things you need to
know for proper operation are (not in order):

- 1) How to not kill yourself with the equipment.
- 2) How to ensure that you're not transmitting spurious signals.
- 3) Standard/common station operating protocols.
- 4) Rules and regulations concerning amateur radio.

If you can handle the above, you'll manage not to die and you won't piss off the other operators. That, in my eyes, is success. Different bands and different modes will require different levels of expertise, so I've got no problem with the concept of various license classes.

>> Ah, well. Why would keeping more people out make you happier?

>

> No, making them work for that which they earn though would be a first
> step.

I didn't have to "work" for my first steps, thanks to my background experience. Excluding 20 wpm code proficiency, I probably won't have to work hard for Amateur Extra. But this doesn't cheapen my license in my eyes. Precisely what do you think others should they have to know before they start transmitting and how will these requirements affect your operating practice? If a person just wants to ragchew on a storebought Kenwood with a storebought antenna, how would a general requirement for something like designing and aligning xtal filters make HAM radio better for you? I'm not suggesting the licensing should be another example of instant gratification, just that people have different aims. Now if you want something to hang on your wall to brag about, could I suggest taking a electronics course (and framing your school transcript), or going for commercial radio repair licensing? Those certificates, unlike the Ham radio tests, are meant to certify true electronics proficiency.

Regards,
Tim Ikeda
timi@mendel.berkeley.edu

Date: Fri, 11 Feb 1994 14:23:22 GMT
From: world!drt@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Exams are Trivial?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote:
: drt@world.std.com (David R Tucker) writes:

: > Michael P. Deignan (md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu) wrote:
: >
: > : The mistake was that while the code requirement was dropped, the
: > : theory portion of the licensing structure was also "dumbed down" to
: > : meet the current education standards of the US population. This was
: > : where the mistake was made. The theory should have been beefed up,
: > : which would have provided no difficulty for these "highly technical"

: > : people the no-code license was supposed to attract.
: >
: > Exactly! Having a no-code entry-level license with elements 2 and 3A
: > might be a good idea, but failing to require 3B for full privileges
: > above 30 MHz probably means that the Technician license currently has
: > the most privileges for the least demonstrated ability of any license
: > in the world. Surely those who are authorized to put up repeaters,
: > set up control links, and put out 1500 W PEP with linears they build
: > themselves ought to demonstrate a bit more theory than is tested in
: > 3A! 3B is not that tough - even that is pretty lenient. For those
: > things, 4A is a more reasonable requirement. We have given away the
: > store.

: David,

: 1) Why then, is the addition of a mere 5 WPM code test make the above ok?

: 2) I agree in part, however as has been pointed out before the tests
: should be an ENTRANCE exam, not the FINAL.

It doesn't. When the Code requirement was removed from the Technician license, the ARRL insisted that, since it would become an entry level license, that all of element 3 along with element 2 was just too difficult for an entry level license, and "element 2+" was created. Before that, no one was allowed full power without passing the material on all of element 3, which is no "final exam." They not only eliminated the code, they eliminated 3B from the *old* technician license to give the current tech plus. "Less theory, same great privileges!"

Code has nothing to do with the point, but the question *does* arise as to what we're going to do when the code requirement disappears, doesn't it? Element 2 carries very limited privileges. But does it make any sense to allow people 1500 watts in the microwave range for that and 3A, and then require 3B for access to 1500 W on HF, and the 2 hardest theory exams for just a few more kHz? Technicians get vast privileges for entry-level knowledge. Clearly, we need a more rational licensing structure, more related to privileges granted, and hopefully a lot simpler.

Element 3B is not that tough, Dan. Precocious folks in their early teens pass it regularly. It hardly compares to, say, the easiest EE final at MIT. We should have made a no-code General, and restricted a no-code entry license requiring 2 and 3A (false advertising to call it "technician") to somewhat more limited privileges. Or so it seems to me.

-drt

David R. Tucker KG2S drt@world.std.com

Date: 11 Feb 1994 05:10:59 -0600
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!
menudo.uh.edu!uuneo.NeoSoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: I just HAD to. WAS: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <23@ted.win.net>, Michael Silva <mjsilva@ted.win.net> wrote:

>
>Dan Pickersgill N8PKV writes (and writes, and writes...)
>
>>(Japan has something like 3 MILLION hams, the US about 600K. Please
>>correct me if my memory on that is incorrect.)
>
>... and his credibility took a nosedive. As a first reality check,

Why am I not surprised.

--
Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are
great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

--Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

Date: Sat, 12 Feb 94 18:53:17 -0500
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@yale.arpa
Subject: I just HAD to. WAS: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Michael P. Daignan <md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu> writes:

>Sigh. Here we go again with the Japanese DISinformation.
>
>The Japanese "no code" license is very similar to CB Radio in the US.

Yeah, here YOU go again with YOUR disinformation.

The Japanese "no code" license is for AMATEUR operation, on AMATEUR bands,
for AMATEUR purposes only. It is by no means a CB-type service.

Date: Thu, 10 Feb 1994 22:25:46 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!
europa.eng.gtefsd.com!library.ucla.edu!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!
kawai@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: I just HAD to. WAS: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Mike Silva (KK6GM) writes:

```
| Dan Pickersgill (N8PKV) writes:
|
| | Japan has something like 3 MILLION hams, the US about 600K. Please
| | correct me if my memory on that is incorrect.
|
| Looking in the US Callbook (1994), I find that Japan has 35,912
| amateurs, or 1.2% of the above figure ... there is no excuse for
| screwing up the facts that badly.
```

Mike, you overlook the fact that the International Callbook lists only stations which have requested to be listed. This is in sharp contrast with the US Callbook, which is based on FCC records and lists all stations in the US. Many of my friends and family were not listed in the International Callbook for many years until we notified the publisher.

If you were to look at the JARL (Japan Amateur Radion League) callbook, you would find much more stations than you would in the International Callbook.

```
|           | SRI International           | work:(415)859-2231 |
|           | Speech Technology and Research | fax:(415)859-5984  |
| Goh Kawai | Menlo Park, CA 94025-3493 USA | home:(415)323-7214 |
|           | internet: kawai@speech.sri.com | radio: N6UOK and 7L1FQE |
```

Date: Sat, 12 Feb 94 19:00:32 -0500
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@yale.arpa
Subject: Operating in Canada?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV <dan@mystis.wariat.org> writes:

>But FCC regulations apply only to the US and it's possessions.

Yeah...which allows the FCC to nail the guy when he returns to the U.S.

Date: Sat, 12 Feb 94 19:01:50 -0500
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@yale.arpa
Subject: Operating in Canada?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill N8PKV <dan@mystis.wariat.org> writes:

>> It's worse than that. Just ask the former President of Panama if the
>> US can invade a sovereign nation, kidnap you, bring you to the US
>> in chains, imprison you for long periods, and try you for supposedly
>> violating US domestic law, even if you never enter the US voluntarily.

Did the government of Panama make any sort of objection after Noriega was arrested?

Date: Sat, 12 Feb 94 18:58:04 -0500
From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!usenet@yale.arpa
Subject: Unbelievable: Pirates on air-to-ground frequencies
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jeff Herman <jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu> writes:

>Well Gang, any comments?

Yeah. There's a big difference between "playing hamster cop" and doing something about HARMFUL, illegal transmissions.

-- Ed Ellers, KD4AWQ

Date: Sat, 12 Feb 1994 04:43:38 GMT
From: munnari.oz.au!spool.mu.edu!sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CL2DB0.CLH@world.std.com>, <CL2uEy.My8@ucdavis.edu>,
<CL35M2.90n@world.std.com>cдав
Subject : Re: Exams are Trivial?

David R Tucker (drt@world.std.com) wrote:
: : Next week by drt:
: : "No-code scum are the reason for incentive licensing."

: : :-)

: Good one. (Shows how much you know - I'm *not* going to claim next
: week that no-coders are scum :-> !!!)

Apologies are in order if I misread your post. I thought that the
essence was that not only did the FCC remove the code from the
requirements for a Tech. license but they also removed 1/3 of the
theory. This seemed to be an attack of the no code tech. licensees. If
it was not meant to be so then again, I apologise.

: Hmmm ... hey, Dan! You forgot to comment on this part (quite
: relevant to the thread!):

: : : [E]lement 3 ... is no "final exam." They not only
: : : elminated the code, they eliminated 3B from the *old* technician
: : : license to give the current tech[nician] ... "Less theory, same great
: : : privileges!"

: Allowing for your well-taken point that these happened at different
: times, you wouldn't disagree with this, would you?

Nope, Can't argue there. But changing standards have been a long
tradition in amateur radio. I think I'll go out and buy a copy of "200
meters and Below"

cheers,

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                   Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu              *
*                   Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                   Davis CA 95616                             *
*-----*
*   The only thing I can officially say for the University is:  *
*   What I say is in no way related to oficial University policy *
*-----*
```

Date: 11 Feb 1994 05:52:32 -0600

From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!
menudo.uh.edu!uuneo.NeoSoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Feb7094022@urth.eng.sun.com>, <2j76gd\$jap@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <1994Feb10.135648.28630@cs.brown.edu>OM

Subject : This is USENET, so even Codeless Techs can post!

In article <1994Feb10.135648.28630@cs.brown.edu>, Michael P. Deignan <md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu> wrote:
>In article <2j76gd\$jap@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
> xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (A great x ray technician!) writes:
>
>|> Hummm....now who was it who posted twenty-two articles to USENET,
>|> whining about Morse code?
>
>Do you have an amateur radio callsign? What is it? If not, why bother
>posting here?

I didn't know what you were REQUIRED to have a call sign to post here. After all, this is USENET, not Two Meters or Citizens Band (wait a minute, aren't they the same thing?).

--

Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

--Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

Date: Fri, 11 Feb 1994 13:51:37 GMT
From: brunix!maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2j76gd\$jap@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <1994Feb10.135648.28630@cs.brown.edu>, <2jfri0\$m3r@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>

Subject : Re: This is USENET, so even Codeless Techs can post!

In article <2jfri0\$m3r@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM (A great x ray technician!) writes:

|> I didn't know what you were REQUIRED to have a call sign to post here.
|> After all, this is USENET, not Two Meters or Citizens Band (wait a minute,
|> aren't they the same thing?).

Well, I don't possibly understand how you can post complaints about a hobby which obviously holds no interest to you (since, after all, if you were interested, you would be licensed.)

Furthermore, I don't know how you can state an opinion that codeless

techs are scum, when you yourself haven't even taken a 5 wpm code test.
Talk about the pot calling the kettle black.

Finally, since you are not involved in any way with the hobby, then
your opinions regarding the hobby do not count, just as my opinions
regarding Japanese politics are of little interest or concern to Japanese
citizens. In fact, I daresay that if I start expressing opinions about
Japanese politics, that Japanese citizens will tell me to get lost and
mind my own business.

So, why don't you do the same?

MD

--

-- Michael P. Deignan
-- Population Studies & Training Center
-- Brown University, Box 1916, Providence, RI 02912
-- (401) 863-7284

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #55

